UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/814,660	03/30/2004	Chien-Min Sung	00802-22708	5907
20551 THORPE NOR	7590 03/13/2007 TH & WESTERN, LLI	EXAMINER		
8180 SOUTH 700 EAST, SUITE 200			YU, GINA C	
SANDY, UT 84070			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1617	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/13/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/814,660	SUNG ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Gina C. Yu	1617 .		

Belofe the filling of all support Biller	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Gina C. Yu	1617 .					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>26 February 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.  I. ☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following							
time periods:  a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date  b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire!  Examiner Note: If how 1 is checked, check either how (2) or	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejecti	on.				
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL							
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,  (a) They raise new issues that would require further co  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or  (d) They present additional claims without canceling a	nsideration and/or search (see NO w); tter form for appeal by materially re corresponding number of finally rej	TE below); ducing or simplifying					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):  6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the							
non-allowable claim(s).  7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed: none. Claim(s) objected to: none. Claim(s) rejected: 1-27. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.	will not be entered, or b)      will will not be entered.	•	_				
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	d sufficient reasons why the affiday	rit or other evidence is	necessary and				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fai ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(	ls to provide a l).				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.				
11.   The request for reconsideration has been considered by see continuation sheet.	ut does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowar	nce because:				
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	allenous MAHBANN	<b>~</b>				

Application/Control Number: 10/814,660

Art Unit: 1617

Continuation of No. 3: In the proposed amendment, the newly added limitations would require further search and consideration.

Page 2

Continuation of No. 7: Applicants assert that the Raty reference does not provide motivation to use the nanoscale diamond particles in the Davies composition. Examiner respectfully disagrees. The fact that the ultradispersity of the nanodiamond is due to the narrow distribution of the particles is uncontested. However, Davies already teaches that the use of micro-scale diamond particles in a cosmetic composition, and Raty teaches that nanodiamond particles have been known. In response to applicants' assertion that the colloidal silica in the Davies does not serve as a dispersant, examiner respectfully disagrees, as the reference teaches that the silica is added to improve the suspension of diamond particles. There is no clear distinction between "manipulation of the carrier itself" and the addition of dispersant, since incorporation of a dispersant to the carrier is deemed as a manipulation thereof. Applicants' assertion that the Davies composition lacks a carrier is unpersuasive, since the vehicle of the composition does serve as a means to deliver the diamond particles to a substrate.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gina C. Yu whose telephone number is 571-272-8605. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, from 8:00AM until 5:30 PM..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan can be reached on 571-272-0629. The fax phone

Application/Control Number: 10/814,660

Art Unit: 1617

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Gina C. Yu Patent Examiner

> Sheeri Patmanabhan Supetvisohy patent examiner

Page 3